REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending in the application and claims 1, 9, and 29 are independent. In light of the following remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Entry of Amendment After Final Rejection

Entry of the Amendment is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 because the Amendment: a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; b) does not present any additional claims without canceling the corresponding number of final rejected claims; and/or c) places the application in better form for an appeal, if an appeal is necessary. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 - *KHIDEKEL*

The Examiner rejects claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0027527, ("*Khidekel*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the outstanding Final Office Action, the Examiner argues that the token of *Khidekel* anticipates the "user signature" and the "role signature." Further, the Examiner cites paragraphs [0034]-[0035] of *Khidekel* and argues that *Khidekel* allegedly teaches the token is stored by the secure server and that this is analogous to "the signing of an access operation." (*7/22/2008 Final Office Action*, page 2). Applicants respectfully disagree.

According to the Examiner, *Khidekel* allegedly teaches that "the token is stored by the secure server so that the user can eliminate the need to authenticate with the server each time he wishes to access information on the server" and cites paragraphs [0034]-[0035]. (*7/22/2008 Final Office Action*, page 2). However, Applicants submit that the Examiner's argument clearly indicates that *Khidekel* cannot anticipate all of the features of "signing an access operation to electronic data by specifying the user signature and the role signature."

As discussed in paragraph [0032] of the instant specification, "actions are assigned <u>both using the assigned user signature and using the assigned role signature(s)</u>." Paragraph [0032] continues to recite the following:

> The multiple signing allows full subsequent reconstruction of all signed data access operations <u>both in association with a really existing person and in association with said person's respective current role affiliation</u>. This satisfies the demands on auditing data access operations without the need, by way of example, to check additional information, such as past service plans, <u>for the purpose of subsequently reconstructing the former role affiliations of people</u>. (Emphasis added.)

Applicants submit that, because *Khidekel* allegedly teaches the token is stored by the secure server so that the user <u>can eliminate the need to authenticate with the server each time</u> he wishes to access information on the server, *Khidekel* fails to teach or suggest <u>the reconstructive features provided by</u> "signing an access operation to electronic data <u>by specifying the user signature **and** the role signature</u>" and accordingly cannot anticipate the method of claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that *Khidekel* fails to teach or suggest all limitations of claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn, and for reasons somewhat similar to those set forth regarding claim 1, Applicants request that the rejections of claims 9 and 29 also be withdrawn. Further, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 2-9, 10-28, and 30-36 also be withdrawn, at least by virtue of their dependency upon claims 1, 9, and 29.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of the pending claims in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Donald J. Daley at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910

Reston, Virginia 20195

(703) 668-8000

DJD/JAC/ADK/mvj